REMARKS

In the July 17, 2007 Final Office Action, the drawings are objected to for minor

informalities and claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being unpatentably

obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,250,691 to Taylor et al.

By the present amendment, claim 3 is amended and claims 7-11 are added. Claims 3-

6 remain pending in the application with claims 3 and 7 being the only independent claims.

The rejections over prior art are respectfully traversed. In summary, Taylor et al. fails

to disclose, teach or suggest a quick connection device having a fastening member disposed

around a circumferential protrusion so as to axially compress a sealing member.

Accordingly, each objection and rejection is addressed in detail below.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to for several informalities. In response, a Submission of

Replacement Drawing Sheets, including corrected drawing figures, is submitted herewith.

Applicants believe the corrected drawings address each of the objections made in the Office

Action. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the

objections to the drawings.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentably obvious over

U.S. Patent No. 6,250,691 to Taylor et al. Amended independent claim 3 recites a quick

connecting device comprising, among other elements, a female member with first and second

circumferential protrusions, a male member with a circumferential groove, first and second

sealing members disposed between the first and second circumferential portions, respectively,

-6-

of the female member and the outer surface of the male member, and a fastening member disposed around the female and male members so as to be in direct contact with the first circumferential protrusion in a manner that compresses the first sealing member and holds the female and male members in place. Taylor fails to teach a fastening member that compresses a sealing member to hold the female and male members in place.

The device of *Taylor* includes a U-shaped fastening member 46 with one of its legs 46a extending radially inwardly and into the circumferential groove 44b of the male member 44 and with its other leg 46b abutting an outer surface of the female member 40 for securing the female and male members. As demonstrated by the gap between the fastening member 46 and the circumferential protrusion 40a illustrated in FIG. 6 of *Taylor*, the fastening member 46 does not directly contact the circumferential protrusion 40a, and therefore does not directly compress the sealing member 42. In fact, any direct contact the fastening member 46 makes with the female member 40 in *Taylor* merely "butts" the female member 40 directly against the end of the male member 44 with no sealing member between them. Thus, *Taylor* does not disclose a fastening member that holds male and female members axially in place by compressing a sealing member via direct contact between a fastening member and a circumferential protrusion, but rather merely discloses a sealing member causing the female member to butt up against the male member without the fastening member compressing a sealing member.

Additionally, as acknowledged in the Office Action, Taylor does not disclose a female member with a second circumferential protrusion with a sealing member disposed between the female member and the outer surface of the male member. Instead, the Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to add a second circumferential protrusion with a sealing member because "duplicating the components of a prior art device is a design consideration within the skill of the art." As disclosed in the specification of the present

Attorney Docket No.: 001058-00021

invention at page 5, lines 33-35, there is no duplication of components because one sealing

member 67 is meant to be primarily a "locking" member and the other sealing member 68 is

meant to be primarily a "sealing" member. The non-duplicative locking member of the

present invention primarily serves to hold the male and female members axially in place,

whereas the sealing member of the present invention serves to provide a satisfactory seal

between the male and female members.

Accordingly, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established because all of

the limitations of the present invention are not disclosed, taught or suggested or rendered

obvious by Taylor. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the

rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Dependent claims 4-6 are also believed to be allowable over Taylor for the same

reasons discussed above. Moreover, these claim recite additional features not found in the

prior art. For example, dependent claim 5 recites that the first and second sealing members

are first and second gaskets, respectively, with the first sealing member serving primarily to

hold the male and female members axially in place and the second gasket serving primarily to

seal the male and female members.

New Claims

New claims 7-11 are added. New independent claim 7 recites a quick connecting

device comprising, among other elements, a female member with first and second

circumferential protrusions; a male member with a circumferential groove with an inclined

surface leading from the circumferential groove; first and second sealing members

respectively disposed between the first and second circumferential portions of the female

member and the outer surface of the male member, the first scaling member being located on

the inclined surface of the male member; and a fastening member disposed around the female

-8-

Attorney Docket No.: 001058-00021

and male members so as to be in contact with the first circumferential protrusion in a manner

that compresses the first sealing member between the first circumferential protrusion of the

female member and the inclined surface of the male member, thereby holding the female and

male members axially in place. Nothing in Taylor discloses, teaches or suggests a male

member having a circumferential groove from which an inclined surface extends and on

which a sealing member is compressed by the female member. Instead, Taylor appears to

disclose only a flat surface generally parallel to the male member on which a sealing member

is compressed, as seen in FIG. 6. Therefore, new independent claim 7 is also believed to be

allowable over Taylor.

New claims 8-11 depend from claim 7 and are therefore allowable for the same

reasons. Moreover, these claims recite additional features not found in the prior art. For

example, dependent claim 11 recites that the first circumferential protrusion has a larger

diameter than the second circumferential protrusion.

In view of the foregoing, claims 3-11 are believed to be in allowable condition as

amended. Prompt and favorable treatment is respectfully solicited.

Please charge any shortage of fees or credit any overpayment thereof to BLANK

ROME LLP, Deposit Account No. 23-2185 (001058-00021). In the event that a petition for

an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith and in the event that a separate

petition does not accompany this report, Applicants hereby petition under 37 C.F.R.

§1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this

submission timely. Any fee due is authorized above.

-9-

Reply to 07/17/07 Office Action Attorney Docket No.: 001058-00021

Respectfully submitted,

By: Yww & Susher
Tara L. Laster

Reg. No. 46,510 Attorney for Applicant

BLANK ROME LLP 600 New Hampshire Avenue Washington, D.C. 20037 Telephone: (202) 772-5800 Facsimile: (202) 772-5858

Date: November 19, 2007